IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

VICTORIA GIAMPA,
Appellant,

vs.

CHARLES GIAMPA,
Respondent.

Filed: February 20, 2009
Tracie K. Lindeman
Clerk of Supreme Court
No. 51422

ORDER AFFIRMING APPEAL IN PART AND DISMISSING APPEAL IN PART

This is a proper person appeal from a district court order awarding $1,500 in attorney fees to the respondent. Eighth Judicial District Court Judge, Family Court Division, Clark County; Sandra Pomrenze, Judge.

Jurisdictional issues regarding the order challenged on appeal

This court has jurisdiction to consider an appeal only where the appeal is authorized by statute or court rule. Taylor Constr. Co. v. Hilton Hotels, 100 Nev. 207, 678 P.2d 1152 (1984). The order designated in appellant's notice of appeal contains numerous rulings by the district court. The challenged order (1) vacated a hearing on various motions filed by appellant, (2) found appellant to be a vexatious litigant, (3) denied appellant's stay motion, (4) denied appellant's "countermotion for an order to show cause why [respondent] should not be held in contempt," and (5) awarded $1,500 in attorney fees to respondent. However,

only the portion of the challenged order awarding attorney fees is substantively appealable. No statute or court rule authorizes an appeal from an order vacating a hearing, finding an individual to be a vexatious litigant, or denying a motion for an order to show cause. See NRAP 3A(b) (listing orders and judgments from which an appeal may be taken). Likewise, no statute or court rule authorizes an appeal from a district court order denying a stay. Brunzell Constr. v. Harrah's Club, 81 Nev. 414, 419, 404 P.2d 902, 905 (1965) (stating that "[a]n order granting or denying a stay f proceedings is not among [the list of statutorily appealable determinations]"). Accordingly, to the extent appellant challenge these unappealable portions of the district court's order, her appeal is dismissed.

Award of attorney fees to respondent.
With regard to appellant's challenge to the portion of the order awarding $1,500 in attorney fees to respondent, appellant has failed to make an substantive arguments with respect to this portion of the appeal. See Edwards v. Emperor's Garden Rest., 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (noting that this court need not consider issues when an appellant fails to present any arguments or authority regarding those issues).
Accordingly, we affirm the district court's award of attorney fees.

Additional district court rulings identified in appellant's civil proper person appeal statement.
Appellant, in her civil proper person appeal statement, has listed numerous other alleged district court rulings on various motions, which she also apparently seeks to challenge on appeal. Appellant, however, makes no salient

argument regarding these motions and does not identify whether written orders addressing these motions were ever entered. Moreover, any orders ruling on the majority of these motions would be considered non-appealable orders. See Taylor Constr. Co., 100 Nev. 207, 678 P.2d 1152.

Accordingly, to the extent any appealable orders resolving these motions have been entered, we affirm the district court's decisions based on appellant's failure to make any salient arguments regarding these decisions. See Edwards, 122 Nev. At 330 n.38, 130 P.3d at 1288 n.38. To the extent any such determinations are not appealable, we dismiss appellant's appeal as to those determinations. Furthermore, to the extent appellant challenges any orders regarding child custody, we hold that any such challenge is moot as the children in question are now adults. See University of Nevada v. Tarkanian, 95 Nev. 389, 394, 594 P.2d 1159, 1162 (1979) (recognizing that this court's duty is to enter a judgment on actual controversies so that the judgment is effective, and that this court should not give opinions upon moot questions).

It is so ORDERED. [1]

_____,J.
Cherry

_____,J.
Saitta

_____,J.
Gibbons

[1] In light of this order, we deny as moot all pending motions on appeal.

cc: Eighth Judicial District Court Dept. E, District Judge,
Family Court Division,
Victoria Margaret Giampa,
Smith Larsen & Wixom,
Eighth District Court Clerk